

***If published, please remove my personal details***

### **Submission Design & Place SEPP Explanation of Intended Effects**

1. The focus on better design and environmental outcomes is welcome, however wholesale change from a prescriptive to principled approach is premature, particularly given other changes to the planning system are also proposed, which outcomes and context is generally not understood by the public.
2. Moreover the changes effectively diminish the role of councils and local planning.
3. Instead it appears the changes have been designed in consultation with industry peak bodies, with the absence of community input. This is disappointing, and contradicts community expectations set by the incoming Coalition government, to give back planning powers to the community.
4. Instead it appears community input has been progressively pulled back that is seeing poor planning outcomes. This was a common dominator at a recent forum organised by Better Planning Network,
5. In response, targeted consultation with community is needed, along with a road map that clearly explains the changes being sought, and provides context, to enable proper feedback before drafting the SEPP. This includes changes to the Heritage Act and rezoning consolidations and changes in use. This is particularly important given the broader public does not know what's proposed, and what the changes will mean to their local neighbourhoods and future development.
6. While the draft EIE effectively turns the planning system on its head to a more agile process, the SEPP looks to facilitate a more rigid approach in terms of increasing the reliance on design professionals.
7. Moreover, given the move to introduce mandatory requirements for design professionals, this has the potential to see a sector undercut the market and produce poorer outcomes. It also prompts the question, who is the arbiter of good taste, and what funding will be provided to educate decision makers and facilitate the changes at council and within the community.
8. Likewise, what processes and funding will be provided to ensure the changes are a success, or address concerns around the absence of community as a key stakeholder; to ensure the changes are not viewed as a fait accompli.
9. In addition, what funding will be provided to monitor the changes, and ensure the changes and outcome are monitored. Further, a trial five year review process would be inappropriate. Rather a two year review process should be mandatory given the amount of change proposed.
10. To achieve a healthy and prosperous community, there should be greater emphasis on wellbeing, liveability and equity, with less emphasis on 'vibrant' places, and 'sufficient densities' that could be misinterpreted.
11. Considerations regarding the cumulative impact is particularly important on smaller more intimate historic street grids. Consequently this should be included as a consideration. Likewise access to greens space, and equity considerations are necessary particularly in high density neighbourhoods (as minimum standards).

12. Local character is not sufficiently understood. For example - what is the desired local character for a new urban precinct? Is this married up with an existing precinct, or will it dominate the precinct and dictate planning outcomes?
13. Moreover the planning process underway for the Westmead Place Strategy appear outcomes driven aimed at responding to the requirements of the University of Sydney and financial yields expected by the Local Land Council. This is at odds with the community's vision for the Cumberland Hospital Heritage Precinct to become a world heritage area, and potential international tourist destination. Yet the current Place Strategy is driven by the aims of individual stakeholder's vs the broader community, where the heritage curtilage and vistas will be lost.
14. Likewise the Western Gateway as a sub precinct at Central Station. The rezoning changes are being driven through Unsolicited Proposal process, that have been driven by announcements by the Premier which are now driving the planning outcomes than good planning. Moreover. the changes will have a disastrous impact on what was previously deemed a special character area and the Clock Tower, with the Western Gateway Sub precinct now setting the scene for the planning outcomes for the larger Central SSP. In short, the process is belly up. To this end how will the Design & Place SEPP, ensure the process stops industry and governments announcements, where the planning outcomes then responds to stakeholders' needs vs the greater public good.
15. Moreover the Western Gateway Sub Precinct borders on Chippendale, with the larger Central Precinct, a large part of Chippendale. Yet the community has never been in the room during the critical upfront strategic planning stage, or invited to a 200 organisation stakeholder consultation process, I.e. not until the proposed rezoning plans were released. This occurred despite repeated requests to Council, the Greater Sydney Commission and Transport for NSW, the lead authority.
16. To this end, how will the SEPP ensure community consultation is effective and responds to outcomes that are currently typically driven by industry or future stakeholders.